## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

SHARON COLEMAN,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
VS.	)	NO. CIV-05-0969-HE
	)	
JO ANNE B. BARNHART,	)	
Commissioner, Social Security	)	
Administration,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

## **ORDER**

Plaintiff Sharon Coleman brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), seeking judicial review of the defendant Commissioner's final decision denying her application for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income benefits under the Social Security Act. Consistent with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B), the case was referred to Magistrate Judge Doyle W. Argo, who issued his Report and Recommendation recommending the Commissioner's decision be affirmed.

Plaintiff filed her application for benefits on November 8, 2002. When it was denied initially and on reconsideration, she requested a hearing before an Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ"). After a hearing at which the plaintiff and a vocational expert testified, the ALJ concluded plaintiff was not disabled within the meaning of the Social Security Act. The Appeals Council denied plaintiff's request for review, making the ALJ's decision the final decision of the Commissioner.

Plaintiff has filed an objection to the Report and Recommendation, <sup>1</sup> raising the same arguments she raised before the magistrate judge. She contends the ALJ made an improper credibility assessment which resulted in an erroneous conclusion that she could perform her past relevant work. Having considered the plaintiff's objections and conducted a de novo review, <sup>2</sup> the court agrees, for essentially the same reasons set forth by the magistrate judge, that the ALJ made an appropriate credibility analysis based upon the evidence in the record. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation is **ADOPTED** and the Commissioner's decision denying plaintiff's claim for benefits is **AFFIRMED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 14<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2006.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Plaintiff's motion for leave to file her objections to the Report and Recommendation out of time [Doc. #17] is **GRANTED**.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C)